

independent claim 15. Furthermore, the Office Action alleges that the outlet vent 74 and the cooling fan 72 of Taki correspond to the first surface of the main casing that is formed with a first exhaust outlet, as recited in independent claim 15. However, neither the low voltage power source circuit board 80 nor the main circuit board 81 of Taki, are disposed adjacent to the outlet vent 74 or to the cooling fan 72 (the alleged first exhaust outlet). In contrast, Taki describes both the low voltage power source circuit board 80 and the main circuit board as being positioned away from the cooling fan 72 and separated from the cooling fan 72 by both the relay circuit board 82 and the high voltage power source circuit board 83, as shown in Fig. 4. Thus, Taki fails to disclose all the features of independent claim 15.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit independent claim 15 is patentable over Taki. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit claim 18, which depends from independent claim 15, is also patentable over Taki for at least the reasons independent claim 15 is patentable over Taki, as well as for the additional features it recites.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Taki in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,452,072 to Ichinokawa et al. (hereinafter "Ichinokawa") and further in view of *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, both Taki and Ichinokawa, alone or in a permissible combination, fail to disclose a first power source circuit board that generates a larger amount of heat than a second power source circuit board, as recited in independent claim 1. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that both Taki and Ichinokawa, alone or in a permissible combination, fail to disclose a first power source circuit board that is disposed downstream of the second power source circuit board in an air passage direction in

which the air passes through the main casing and is discharged through the first exhaust outlet, as recited in independent claim 1.

The Office Action alleges that the low voltage power source circuit board 80 and the high voltage power source circuit board 83 of Taki correspond to the first power source circuit board and second power source circuit board, respectively, as recited in independent claim 1. However, the Office Action admits Taki fails to disclose that the low voltage source circuit board 80 of Taki generates a larger amount of heat than the high voltage power source circuit board 83 of Taki, but relies on the teachings of Ichinokawa. Particularly, the Office Action alleges the low voltage power supply board 148 of Ichinokawa would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in the apparatus described by Taki.

However, as agreed during the personal interview, Ichinokawa merely describes that the low voltage power supply board 148 "gives off a large amount of heat during operation" but fails to disclose that the low voltage power supply board 148 gives off a larger amount of heat than any power supply board (see Ichinokawa, col. 20, lines 62-68, and col. 21, lines 1-6). Importantly, Ichinokawa fails to teach or even suggest that the low voltage power supply board gives off a larger amount of heat than at least one other voltage power supply board. Thus, Ichinokawa fails to cure the deficiencies of Taki. Moreover, neither Taki nor Ichinokawa disclose a first power source circuit board that generates a larger amount of heat than a second power source circuit board, as recited in independent claim 1.

Additionally, the Office Action alleges it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Taki by reversing the positions of the low voltage power source circuit board 80 and the high voltage power source circuit board 83 of Taki, because it has been held that the rearranging of parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art (citing *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70). However, as agreed during the personal interview, it would not have been have obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, because the features

of independent claim 1 provide a solution to a long felt need as described in the specification at least at page 1, lines 10 - page 3, line 11.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is patentable over Taki and Ichinokawa. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5, 6, 16 and 19 are patentable at least in view of the patentability of independent claim 1 and 15, from which they variously depend, as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Taki in view of Ichinokawa and *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70, and further in view of Japanese Published Patent Application No. 2002-189320 to Akio et al. (hereinafter "Aiko"); claims 7-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Taki in view of Ichinokawa and *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,173,132 to Kida et al. (hereinafter "Kida"); claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Taki in view of Ichinokawa, *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70, and Kida, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,522,847 to Nanjo; claims 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Taki in view of Ichinokawa, and further in view of Kida; and claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Taki in view of Ichinokawa and Kida, and further in view of Nanjo. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

These rejections are premised upon the presumption that Taki and Ichinokawa variously disclose all of the features of independent claims 1 and 15, from which claims 2-4, 7-14, 17 and 20-25 depend. As discussed above, Taki and Ichinokawa do not disclose all of the features of independent claims 1 and 15 as they are variously applied. Thus, claims 2-4, 7-14, 17 and 20-25 are patentable at least in view of the patentability of independent claims 1

and 15, as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:LXF/tjx

Date: August 2, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
